

**FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP**

PATENT TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW

1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE

SEVENTH FLOOR

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-2579

TELEPHONE (216) 861-5582

FAX (216) 241-1666 AND (216) 241-5147

---

DATE:	May 25, 2004
TO:	UTPTO
ATTN.:	Examiner: Kumiko C. Koyama
FACSIMILE NO.:	571 273 2394
FROM:	Thomas Tillander
RE:	Your Serial No. 09/944,536      Our Ref.: XERZ200421
TOTAL PAGES:	3 (including cover sheet)

---

***Please call us immediately at (216) 861-5582 if this transmission is incomplete or illegible.***

**Comments**

Dear Examiner Koyama -

Thank you very much for returning my telephone call and setting up a tentative appointment for June 7, 2004, at 10:00 AM for a telephone interview in the subject case.

During our conversation you asked that we send you some written description of the points I wish to discuss during our interview. We hope you will find the following a satisfactory response to that request.

At a minimum, we would like to discuss claims 29, and 30. These claims were introduced in Amendment C, which we mailed on February 11, 2004. They are included in the rejection on Page 2 of the Office Action. However, we have been unable to find a portion of the explanation of the rejection that appears directed to these claims.

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission include information from the firm of Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP that might be legally privileged and/or confidential. The information is intended for the use of only the individual or entity named on this cover sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of these documents, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this transmission, is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, these documents should be returned to this firm as soon as possible, and we ask that you notify us immediately by telephone so we can arrange for their return to us without cost to you.

N:\XERZ\200421\TNT0000164V001.doc

Claim 29 recites determining a sub-section delimiter consists of indicating at least one of a font size, a font, a text location and a specific point within the document. We see no disclosure or suggestion in Okamoto or Kuga that determining a sub-section delimiter consists of indicating at least one of a font size, a font, a text location and a specific point within the document.

Claim 30 recites determining a sub-section delimiter consists of using a symbol representing a demarcation point on a printed version of the document as the sub-section delimiter. For example, claim 30 is related to the subject matter discussed on page 7, lines 9-19 of the present application. We see no disclosure or suggestion in Okamoto or Kuga that determining a sub-section delimiter consists of using a symbol representing a demarcation point on a printed version of the document as the sub-section delimiter.

With regard to the other claims, such as, for example, claim 1, we would like to discuss the interpretation of Okamoto and Kuga presented in the Office Action, as well as the Examiner's interpretation of the claim language of the present application in the hopes of reaching some agreement.

For example, the Office Action says that in Okamoto, the combination of a line return, segmentation code and character count is disclosure of a delimiter definition. We would like to submit that even if that were the case, Okamoto does not disclose or suggest generating an index for a document (or even the logical architecture of Okamoto) with found items corresponding to the sub-section delimiter occurrences (as recited in claim 1). Instead, as pointed out in the bottom of page two and the first full paragraph of page 3 of the Office Action mailed May 6, 2004, occurrences of the combination of a line return, segmentation code and character count go through many other checks, tests, and determinations. Only a small subset of the occurrences of the combination of a line return, segmentation code and character count cause an entry to be made in the logical architecture of Okamoto. Therefore, Okamoto does not disclose or suggest generating an index for a document with found items corresponding to the sub-section delimiter occurrences.

Kuga discloses searching for occurrences of words included in a predefined list. We would like to submit that this predefined list of words is not a delimiter definition. A delimiter definition is a description of aspects of text, not specific text strings. While it is true that text can be used as an aspect of a delimiter definition (for example, the word --chapter-- can be an aspect of a delimiter definition), and an occurrence corresponding to the delimiter definition might include such text (for example, --Chapter IV: New Hope-- might be an occurrence of a delimiter definition including the word --chapter--) the desired text string itself is not a delimiter definition as the phrase is used in the present application. Furthermore, having to generate a list of every word that is desired to be included in an index or table of contents is just the sort of thing the subject matter of the present application is directed at avoiding (e.g., page 1, lines 26-30).

We trust that the above will serve as a useful indication of the subject matter we wish to cover in our telephone interview. Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Regards,

Tom Tillander  
Patrick Roche